



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/864,329	05/25/2001	Yim Kwong Ng	14148ROUS01U	2311

626 7590 10/19/2005

NORTEL NETWORKS LIMITED
P. O. BOX 3511, STATION C
OTTAWA, ON K1Y 4H7
CANADA

EXAMINER

CHANG, SUNRAY

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2121

DATE MAILED: 10/19/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/864,329

Applicant(s)

NG ET AL.

Examiner

Sunray Chang

Art Unit

2121

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 29 July 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 2-5, 7-9 and 12-15 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This office action is in responsive to the paper filed on July 29, 2005.
2. Claims 2 – 5, 7 – 9 and 12 – 15 are presented for examination.

Claims 2 – 5, 7 – 9 and 12 – 15 are rejected.

Claims 1, 6, 10 and 11 are cancelled.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

3. **Claims 2 – 5, 7 – 9 and 12 – 15 are rejected** under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Haig Michael Zadikian et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,631,134 and referred to as

Art Unit: 2121

Zadikian hereinafter), and in view of Douglas A. Holmberg (U.S. Patent No. 6,041,932 and referred to as **Holmberg** hereinafter).

(Zadikian as set forth above generally discloses the basic inventions.)

Regarding independent claims 12 – 15,

Zadikian teaches,

- A platform [Fig. 4] comprising
- a plurality of slots for receiving power service modules [Fig. 4] and associated functional modules [SP, SM, LC] arranged in functional groups [SP, SM, LC grouped horizontally in Fig. 4], [See also Col. 12, Line 55 – Col. 19, Line 42]
- each slot [Fig. 4], power service module of a functional group [SP, SM, LC], being associated with a sub group [one SM420 and four LC410, Fig. 4], and being provided with a respective visual identifier [variable identifier] for slot and module identification [group matrix Line cards]; [Fig. 4 and also Col. 12, Line 55 – Col. 19, Line 42]
- each said subgroup [one SM420 and four LC410, Fig. 4] sharing at least one alpha identifier, numeric identifier and colour identifier [Col. 9, Line 38 – Col. 10, Line 19] for appropriate matching of the respective slot, power service module and associated functional modules of a functional group during service [Fig. 4]. [See also Col. 12, Line 55 – Col. 19, Line 42]

Zadikian does not teach, each visual identifier comprising a combination of at least two of an alpha identifier, a numeric identifier and a colour identifier, and each visual identifier comprising combination of an alpha identifier, a numeric identifier and a colour identifier.

Holmberg teaches,

- each visual identifier comprising a combination of at least two of an alpha identifier, a numeric identifier and a colour identifier, [Col. 2, Line 55 – Col. 3, Line 10] and
- each visual identifier comprising combination of an alpha identifier, a numeric identifier and a colour identifier. [Col. 2, Line 55 – Col. 3, Line 10] for the purpose of indication.

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify the teaching of **Zadikian** to include “each visual identifier comprising a combination of at least two of an alpha identifier, a numeric identifier and a colour identifier, or each visual identifier comprising combination of an alpha identifier, a numeric identifier and a colour identifier”, for the purpose of indication.

Regarding dependent claims 2 and 7,

Zadikian teaches,

- an alpha identifier, a numeric identifier or a colour identifier [variable identifier]. [Col. 9, Line 38 – Col. 10, Line 19]

Regarding dependent claims 3 and 8,

Zadikian teaches,

- at least one of shelf controller cards, fans, routing, synchronization and protection modules and port cards forming a functional group and within a functional group [SP, SM, LC

Art Unit: 2121

grouped horizontally in Fig. 4] each functional module is provided with a label associated with the functional group [SP430, shelf processor, Fig. 4]. [Fig. 2, Col. 12, Line 55 – Col. 13, Line 5, and Col. 9, Line 38 – Col. 10, Line 19, see also Col. 12, Line 55 – Col. 19, Line 42]

Regarding dependent claims 4 and 9,

Zadikian teaches,

- the power service modules are divided into sub-groups [one SM420 and four LC410, Fig. 4], each subgroup associated with the functional groups [SM, SP, LC] of the functional modules [Fig. 4];

Zadikian does not teach each subgroup and its associated functional group are assigned a colour identifier.

Holmberg teaches a colour identifier. [Col. 2, Line 55 – Col. 3, Line 10] for the purpose of indication.

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify the teaching of **Zadikian** to include "a colour identifier", for the purpose of indication.

Regarding dependent claim 5,

Zadikian teaches,

- a port side and a switch side; [Col. 13, Line 62 – Col. 14, Line 30]

Response to Amendment

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. Applicants argue that the combinations of references cited by examiner fail to disclose a sub-grouping where a sub group is created for each slot on the network platform and consists of a distinct set of elements from at least one additional functional group and where each subgroup element shares at least one visual identifier” in claims 12 – 15 is disagreed with. **Zadikian** teaches shelf processor (SP), line cards (LC), group matrices (GM) and shelf switches (SES) in an I/O bay as shown in Fig. 4, each slot fitted with one module selected from the group of SP, LC, GM and SES. **Zadikian** further teaches sub-groups with one SM420 and four LC410, and sub-groups been controlled by one SP430 as shown in Fig. 4. Detail descriptions can be found in **Zadikian** [Col. 12, Line 55 – Col. 19, Line 42].

Applicants try to overcome the previous 103 rejections by citing new sets of claims with several different combinations of “alpha identifier”, “numeric identifier” and “colour identifier” to replace original claims. New references have been cited for rejecting the newly claimed combinations of identifiers.

Conclusion

5. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after

Art Unit: 2121

the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Sunray Chang whose telephone number is (571) 272-3682. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 7:00-4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Anthony Knight can be reached on (571) 272-3687. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-746-3506.

Sunray Chang
Patent Examiner
Group Art Unit 2121
Technology Center 2100
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office


Anthony Knight
Supervisory Patent Examiner
Group 3600

October 11, 2005